

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 16-24, and 46-65 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, 46, and 53 being the independent claims. Claim 8 is sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 10-15 and 25-45 were canceled in a previous amendment. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 46-49, 51, and 53-56 are sought to be amended. Claims 59 - 65 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Priority

The Examiner has noted that the present application 09/864,293 is a Continuation-In-Part (CIP) of Applications 09/559,964 and 09/393,390. The Examiner has alleged that this Application, 09/864,293, does not benefit from an earlier filing date due to inadequate support. Applicants elect not to substantively respond to the Examiner's contentions at this time, but reserve the right to do so in the future.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the final Office Action dated March 18, 2008, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,516,341 to Shaw *et al.* ("Shaw") in view of U.S. Patent No.

5,848,396 to Gerace ("Gerace") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,776 to Buckingham *et*

Atty. Dkt. No. 1933.0010008

al. ("Buckingham") in view of International Patent Application Publication No. WO 00/62463 to Pivowar *et al.* ("Pivowar"). Furthermore, claims 3, 5, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gerace in view of Buckingham in view of Pivowar as applied above, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,210 to Goldhaber *et al.* ("Goldhaber"). Claims 8, 23, and 46-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gerace in view of Buckingham in view of Pivowar as applied above, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,127 to Bandera *et al.* ("Bandera"). Claims 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shaw in view of Gerace in view of Buckingham in view of Pivowar in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811 to Angles *et al.* ("Angles"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 8 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 8 has been rendered moot.

Independent claim 1 recites features that distinguish over the applied references.

For example, claim 1 recites:

- (5) generating tracking data representative of a browsing activity of the user while using the device; and
- (6) performing a second sync operation comprising the step of:
 - transmitting the tracking data and the at least one pre-populated field to the server .

Independent claims 16, 46, and 53 recite similar features as claim 1.

Support for the above-mentioned features of claim 1 can be found, for example, in U.S. Patent No. 6,779,042, which was incorporated by reference into the present

application. For example, Col. 16, lines 40-67 and FIG. 1F1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,042 provides support for the above-mentioned features.

None of the applied references teach or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features of claims 1, 16, 46, and 53. Thus, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 16, 46, and 53 and their respective dependent claims are also patentable over the applied references.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 1-7, 9, 16-24, and 46-58 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims 59 - 65

New claims 59-61, which depend from independent claim 1, and 62-64, which depend from independent claim 16, are patentable over the applied references at least in view of their dependency to their respective independent claim and further in view of their own respective features. For example, the art of record does not teach or suggest a synchronization token which is used to select content for a device.

New claim 65 includes the features of now canceled claim 8 and independent claim 1 from which it depended. Applicants assert that new claim 65 is patentable over the applied references at least in view of the remarks presented above with respect to independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 59 - 65 be passed to allowance.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael Q. Lee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,239

Date: 11/17/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

884339_1.DOC